

1963

13889

sequent vote on the Kefauver amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the substitute amendment should be agreed to, the Senate then would vote on the Kefauver amendment, as amended.

The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BREWSTER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. MCCARTHY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. MCGOVERN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore I withhold my vote. The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. If present and voting the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is paired with the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay," and the Senator from Hawaii would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is paired with the

Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM] are necessarily absent and, if present and voting, would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 11, as follows:

[No. 129 Leg.]

YEAS—60

Alken	Hayden	Prouty
Allott	Hickenlooper	Proxmire
Anderson	Hill	Randolph
Beall	Holland	Ribicoff
Bennett	Humphrey	Robertson
Bible	Jackson	Russell
Boggs	Javits	Saltonstall
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Case	Keating	Simpson
Cooper	Kuchel	Smith
Cotton	Mansfield	Sparkman
Curtis	McGee	Stennis
Dirksen	McIntyre	Symington
Dodd	Metcalf	Talmadge
Eastland	Miller	Thurmond
Edmondson	Morton	Tower
Ellender	Mundt	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	Muskie	Williams, Del.
Fong	Pearson	Young, N. Dak.
Goldwater	Fell	Young, Ohio

NAYS—11

Church	Gruening	Moss
Clark	Lausche	Nelson
Douglas	Long, La.	Neuberger
Gore	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—29

Bartlett	Hart	McCarthy
Bayh	Hartke	McClellan
Brewster	Hruska	McGovern
Burdick	Inouye	McNamara
Byrd, Va.	Johnston	Mechem
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Morse
Carlson	Kefauver	Pastore
Dominick	Kennedy	Smathers
Engle	Long, Mo.	Yarborough
Fulbright	Magnuson	

So Mr. ANDERSON's substitute amendment, for the Kefauver amendment, was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I was on my way to the Chamber to vote. I was delayed by business matters, and barely missed the vote. Had I been able to reach the floor of the Senate in time to respond to my name when it was called, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, there was a previous agreement for a yea-and-nay vote on the so-called Kefauver amendment. Since then there has been a yea-and-nay vote on a supplanting amendment, which the Senate has adopted. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the order for the yea-and-nay vote on the Kefauver amendment be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the Kefauver amendment as amended by the substitute amendment offered by the

Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, yesterday, during the discussion of the amendment that was then pending to the authorization bill, I agreed that I would withhold an objection I had to the unanimous-consent agreement that was then being propounded, with the understanding that after the amendment was disposed of I would have the floor. This has been worked out, and I have the floor. If there is anything of great importance to be considered at this point, I will be happy to yield the floor. Otherwise, I advise the Senate that I will take about 20 or 25 minutes for my speech.

A CALL FOR A NEW NATIONAL PURPOSE: THE WILL TO WIN

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it is with mixed emotions that I rise today to remind Senators of one blunt fact, as inescapable as it is obvious: 90 miles from the American coast the island of Cuba still exists. Almost within sight of the center of free world strength and security, this advance base of aggressive Communist subversion remains inviolate. With every passing day, this Soviet-supported, Moscow-dominated bandit regime tightens its oppressive grip upon the Cuban people and drives their shattered liberties more deeply into bondage.

More pointedly, I direct these reminders to that little band of timid men who presume to guide our Nation's destinies—who have substituted bravado for boldness, rhetoric for resolution. And I call upon them, in the name of our tarnished national honor as well as our imperiled national security, to make good their own repeated pledge that Cuba will once more be free.

FEAR—FRUSTRATION—SHAME

I have referred, Mr. President, to the mixed emotions with which I speak on this occasion. In part, it is with fear—fear for the security of this Nation and this hemisphere. A second part is a sense of frustration—frustration over the endless vacillation shown by the administration, and over its unfulfilled pledges for effective action. Still a third part is that of shame—the shameful gap between the administration's promises to the Cuban freedom fighters, both within that captive island and throughout the hemisphere, and its irresolute performance. In the name of the American people, administration officials have promised the Cuban patriots that their nation shall be restored to the community of free nations. But it would be closer to the truth to say that the administration is at open war with the forces of free Cuba—by effectively quarantining those potential leaders who have sought sanctuary and a base of future operations in the United States, and by contributing greatly to their fragmentation and disarray.

I speak also, Mr. President, with a mounting sense of anger—over the

evasiveness, the equivocation, and the arrogance with which administration officials are now apparently putting a damper even on debate and discussion of our Cuban policy. But silence is no solution. The Cuban problem will not simply go away if we pretend it does not exist. Nor will the Soviet armed presence in Cuba go away, so long as we disregard the near ultimatum we proclaimed during the crisis of last October and so long as we disavow the bold resolution we showed then.

COUNSELS GO UNHEEDED

I remind my colleagues of another fact, Mr. President: that the Founding Fathers, with the wisdom that has endowed this Nation with a sound and enduring system of government, reposed in the U.S. Senate the duty and the privilege of advising the President on foreign policy. We are still, from time to time, allowed to register our approval of an executive fait accompli—as we must soon consider the proposed test ban treaty. But at the moment of decision, our advice is no longer sought. Other counsels go unheeded. Our sober proposals are dismissed with a glib phrase, or with contemptuous silence.

The time for silent and unquestioning consent is long since past, Mr. President. Let us, rather, assert the privilege of senatorial advice and strive to discharge our solemn duty. If the administration has moved on to other concerns, and if the American press is too preoccupied to make note of the fact that the Communist base in Cuba remains and grows and hardens, then it is up to this body to ask probing questions and to demand unequivocal answers. It is our grave responsibility to focus public attention and concern on the unsolved problem of a Communist Cuba and to reflect, in our deliberations and our advice, the firm resolve of the American people that Cuba must once more be free.

The Congress has already attempted to strengthen the President's hand by formal resolution. It has also written into the law of the land specific penalties against those nations which persist in doing business with Communist Cuba. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 imposed a flat ban on all forms of foreign aid to nations whose merchant ships carry strategic goods to Cuba; and it charged the President to justify, before appropriate committees of Congress, any exceptions to the ban on economic aid to those nations still engaged in commercial traffic. Yet, as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has recently demonstrated, the President has made no such justification, and U.S. aid in the sum of at least a quarter of a billion dollars has gone to 27 nations whose ships have been or are now trading with Communist Cuba. I join, too, with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] in demanding to know when this administration intends to start laying down the law—or reporting to Congress why it has failed to do so.

APPROVE JOPLIN SPEECH

Three months ago, speaking in Joplin, Mo., I outlined a course of action designed to hasten the collapse of the Castro regime without involving this na-

tion in open warfare—not necessarily the only or the best course, but one, I am convinced, that would surely contribute to this purpose. From any administration spokesman, the response has been dead silence. From many concerned Americans, I am proud to say, expressions of approval have served simply to confirm that, on this overriding issue of national security and national honor, the American people are far ahead of their leaders. Very briefly, these were my proposals:

First. The imposition of a tight quarantine—a so-called pacific blockade—on virtually all traffic to and from Communist Cuba and most particularly on all strategic goods. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has also proposed this course of action, in a resolute speech recently delivered in this chamber.

Second. The organization of a free Cuban government-in-exile which this Nation would promptly recognize as the only legitimate representative of Cuban sovereignty and would help to prepare for the ultimate liberation of the Cuban homeland.

Third. The suspension of all negotiations with all Communist powers pending the complete removal from Cuba of the Soviet presence—whether we delude ourselves with the myth that they are "technicians" or face squarely the fact that they constitute an open military force.

Fourth. A categorical declaration that any overt acts against the Cuban people by these Soviet mercenaries would be considered an act of war against the United States.

Four clear-cut proposals for immediate action—offered nearly 3 months ago as a sober contribution toward the goal of Cuban liberation that the administration itself has repeatedly affirmed is its goal. And what has happened since then? Let us look at the record, Mr. President.

BOLD WORDS VERSUS TIMID DEEDS

It is a record, I am compelled to conclude, that abundantly illustrates the shameful gap to which I have already referred: the gap between bold words and timid deeds.

The clear lessons and the matchless opportunity opened up by the missile crisis of last October have been frittered away. The concept of a leakproof quarantine, boldly created and put into effect in October to meet the immediate security needs of this Nation and hemisphere is now rejected as current policy on the ground that now it is an "act of war." We are warned that we dare not "rock the boat"—least of all in the new era of reconciliation and accommodation of which, by the administration's own admission, the present test ban treaty is but a first step. Boldness, resolution, and staunch purpose—even the very will to win itself—are now out of fashion. We are not permitted to press any advantage, at this time of maximum tension within the Communist empire, against the extended lines of supply and materiel which alone sustain the Castro regime.

I need not repeat the eloquent testimony already offered in this chamber by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOM-

NICK] of the scope and intensity of Communist subversion throughout the hemisphere. He has spelled it all out—in every chilling detail. From its sanctuary in Cuba, aggressive world communism is reaching out to menace every free government in the Americas—in Venezuela, in Bolivia, in Guatemala, in Peru, in Colombia. And what has been the administration response? That we must make the world safe for diversity and for peaceful coexistence.

A SOVIET BLOODBATH

But most shameful of all has been the willingness of the administration—all its firm pledges and dire warnings to the contrary—to acquiesce in the creation of a second Hungary, 90 miles from our own shores, in occupied Cuba. As the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] has so eloquently charged—with massive documentation from the firsthand reports of Cuban freedom fighters—the forces of free Cuba are under systematic attack not only by Castro's Soviet-maintained Cuban militia but also, directly, Soviet mercenaries. Armed chiefly with their superb courage, the partisans of free Cuba are victims of a mounting Soviet bloodbath; in the Cuban hills, a grim second Budapest is now unfolding. In the face of this evidence, Mr. President, can we doubt the effect throughout Latin America on their faith in U.S. intentions, and the honor of its pledged word?

The record, however, is not yet complete.

On June 17, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] offered before this body a bold proposal for Cuban liberation. He suggested that this Nation spur the formation of a unified Provisional Government of Free Cuba by two means: by the offer of a territorial base for this provisional government on Cuban soil, at the U.S. Naval Station at Guantanamo Bay; and by the promise of prompt U.S. recognition of this regime, this spearhead of ultimate liberation, as the legitimate representative of Cuban sovereignty. The effect of such an act would be electric, throughout the Americas and the entire free world. It would signify, beyond any doubt, that this Nation has at last determined to match its word with deeds that must ultimately roll back the aggressive thrust of Communist imperialism. And it would put an end, once and for all, to the shameful fiction that the Castro gang represents anything except its Soviet masters and their implacable thirst for world dominion.

GREETED WITH SILENCE

But this proposal, too, has been greeted with official silence—and then with a variety of spurious charges based on legalistic nit picking. Let those who fret so over the legality of the Allott proposal reflect on the lesson of Korea: had President Truman in 1950 waited for squads of international lawyers to reconcile their endless differences, the U.N. Charter would be today nothing more than a scrap of paper, and all of Korea would have been swallowed up within the Communist empire. As they read today's headlines about Chinese Communist raids on our Korean outposts with

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

13891

the resumption of American casualty lists, they should realize that peaceful coexistence based on an armistice, or a treaty, is no substitute for victory. And let the spokesmen of the administration reflect as well on the clear lessons of last October: it was not international law which sanctioned our successful quarantine of Cuba. Rather, the sanction was provided by history—and by the overriding needs of national and hemispheric security.

I do not wish to be misunderstood, Mr. President. It is not to prove the special virtues of my colleagues on this side of the aisle that I repeat my own suggestions or the bold proposal of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. Where national security and national honor are at stake, there can be no Republicans and no Democrats. Parties and men may disagree over the means—but there must be and there is an overwhelming American consensus where the goal of national policy is concerned—and that is the goal of freedom with honor.

ANY PROGRAM FOR FREEDOM

We who join in a mounting call for effective action are not jealously wedded to a new departure in Cuban policy of our own devising. What we seek—what we demand—is any program of action that promises to remove the clear and present menace of Communist aggression from this hemisphere and, ultimately, to restore freedom to the captive Cuban people. That is our goal—not for crude partisan advantage but, rather, for the cause of freedom.

The thrust of modern warfare need not be purely or even primarily military. Indeed, in the continuing struggle of freedom against tyranny—of free world forces against the implacable aggression of militant world communism—the weapons of psychological warfare are often more effective. In this arsenal, the essential weapon is simply the will to victory. It is bold purpose. It is—as the Jackson committee emphasized as long ago as 1953—the clear and unambiguous message, to all our friends and to every potential enemy, that America means business. We believe in the principles of freedom. And we are prepared to fight for its preservation, for its extension—and where tyranny rules a once free people, for its restoration.

There is nothing mysterious about psychological warfare. It is simply the effective implementation of resolute national policy. The traditional instruments are information and propaganda, transmitted by every medium—radio, leaflets, balloons, even messages scrawled on walls and public monuments. In the case of the battle for ultimate Cuban liberation—and I do not speak boastfully—we have at our command the ultimate weapon of truth, to blast the pretensions of the Castro Communists and to expose the reality of their cruel tyranny.

EXPLOIT PSYCHOLOGICAL ARSENAL

But we have not yet begun to exploit all the weapons in our psychological arsenal. First, I repeat, must come bold policy and resolute will. Only when we have that can we plan definite programs.

For instance, during the Korean war, we offered a bounty to any Communist flier who defected with a Soviet aircraft. Let us now renew this offer—of a substantial reward, a job, and a guarantee of asylum and beam it to Cuba. In Cuba today, there are Migs and Soviet bombers poised to fly against us—and to help suppress any internal uprisings against the Castro-Communist regime. By offering a generous bounty, we can raise tremendously the price of continued Soviet occupation of Cuba and the cost of maintaining there a Soviet-supplied, Soviet-led striking force. The threat of defection alone may force the practical men of the Kremlin to reconsider the risks and the costs and the psychological disadvantages of their present aggressive policy—not only in Cuba, but also throughout the hemisphere.

Let us go further: We should offer asylum not only to fliers, but also to any and all Soviet soldiers now engaged in the occupation of Cuba. Judging from the lessons of Eastern and Central Europe and of Korea—and remembering the lesson of the Berlin wall—the odds are strongly in our favor. And defection would be relatively simple—either over the lines and into Guantanamo, or as part of the steady flow of Cubans who leave their country by small boat. The means for this seaborne exodus already exists in the fleet which moves regularly between Cuba and Florida and the islands of the Caribbean.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MUNDT. First, I should like to congratulate the Senator from Utah on the presentation of a very challenging and constructive speech, and especially to congratulate him on bringing up what to me, at least, is a new idea, one which I have not heretofore heard advanced authoritatively—namely, the encouragement of defections from Cuban soil to American soil.

It seems to me the Senator from Utah has hit upon a concept which well deserves careful consideration by the administration. I believe the administration either should proceed to implement it by a program of this type, or should make some reasonable answer as to why it feels such a program has serious deficiencies.

After hearing the Senator's proposal for the first time, I believe he proposes a far better program than the ill-conceived administration program of trading tractors for Cubans, which was complained about so bitterly by Dr. Milton Eisenhower in his recent book, in which he alleges the administration induced him to participate in the program, and that then, when the American reaction was almost universally antagonistic, the administration walked out and left poor Milton holding the sack.

Although I think Dr. Eisenhower might have exercised a little more prudence before joining in a concept of this kind, I feel he is entitled to complain, after he was pulled into the movement but then found, when the results were antagonistic, that the administration walked out and left him holding the sack. Perhaps next time he should be more

cautious before going along with a concept not in conformity with American traditions.

The Senator from Utah has advocated a concept by which, if we induce Cubans to come to our country, not only would the Cubans who wish to be free and Soviet soldiers who wish to be free come to the United States, but, in addition, we would utilize our so-called bounty to enable them to succeed after they arrived in our country—by helping them to get jobs, find homes, and feel at home in the colony of freemen.

I wonder whether the Senator from Utah has found elsewhere any support for this concept. I believe his proposal is a reasonable and very attractive one. I hope he will find much support for it.

Mr. BENNETT. I have not attempted to measure public opinion before suggesting it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. It is a splendid suggestion, by far more attractive than the policy which now being consummated, whereby the United States paid black-mail—by providing medicines—for bringing enslaved Cubans to our area of freedom. By means of the Senator's proposal, not only would Cubans be brought to freedom, but we would avoid the kind of refugee problems which exist in Miami as a result of the medical exchanges, for those who came here would find work and the opportunity to become productive citizens in their new, free home.

Mr. BENNETT. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from South Dakota, and I am grateful for his support of this idea.

There is also a further difference, particularly if the offer resulted in the defection of Cuban fliers. When we contributed \$53 million worth of medicine to Castro, we were bolstering his economy. But by means of my proposal, we would be drawing funds and value out of his economy, and would be increasing the costs to the Russians of maintaining themselves in Cuba.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Idaho makes a very good point, because thus we would drain out not only important people but also, in the case of Migs or Soviet military installations, things of definite use to the Soviet economy and security.

In dealing with a problem as old as the Cuban challenge and the Communist takeover by Castro in Cuba, new ideas are hard to come by. So I salute the Senator from Utah for having developed this idea; and I hope that by expressing it and by obtaining the widespread publicity it deserves, the administration will either submit to us a plausible argument as to why the Senator's proposal should not be adopted, or else will accept it—with the result that, at long last, something will be done to try to reduce the size of the Communist menace in Cuba.

Mr. ALLOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I too, wish to congratulate the Senator from Utah for keeping this subject before the Senate and the people of America. I also wish to congratulate the Senator for the contribu-

13892

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

tion he makes by his speech—which I have had an opportunity to read—which shows his willingness to face this issue.

We are told by the administration that because of this or that, we cannot do certain things. For example, that we must not recognize a government in exile, because if we did, we would then release Castro from his obligations as a responsible government in the world.

But Castro has already confiscated all American property, and much other property in Cuba; and he has confiscated our Embassy. Nevertheless, the administration and the State Department are still hanging on to the theory that we are dealing with a responsible man, with a responsible government.

What the Senator from Utah has proposed, it seems to me, is that we stop acting like a prize fighter who is beaten and start to act like a prize fighter who intends to win. The Senator from Utah proposes several things—particularly, I think, propaganda things—by which we can win. We can win there; but we must start thinking. The Senator has put emphasis upon the will to win. If, in this administration, there is no will to win, certainly there is not going to be any Cuban program.

I hold in my hand a copy of a letter sent to one Senator by the Assistant Secretary of State. It shows a complete lack of will to come to grips with anything. We have been told we cannot do that—for example, that we cannot adopt the proposal made by the Senator from Colorado on June 17, because the groups are so fragmented.

But the express purpose of that proposal was to offer an inducement to the exiled Cuban groups to create unity. Every time the Government of this country shows a lack of will to proceed along a definite course, the groups fragment just that much more. So I wish to say that I think the proposal of the Senator from Utah makes sense. I think all the proposals made on the floor of the Senate in the last 2 months constitute—although perhaps not the whole answer—methods by which our country can adopt a different policy toward Cuba. I believe, as the Senator from Utah does, that this is the will of the American people.

Mr. BENNETT. I appreciate the contribution of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I congratulate the Senator on the cogent presentation of his views, particularly his presentation of a new idea in regard to the festering Cuban problem. The Senator has made a point which deserves to be further stressed. The only response from administration spokesmen to the numerous suggestions of various Senators that certain things be done with regard to Cuba has been dead silence. It is almost impossible—in fact, so far as I am concerned, it has been impossible—to arouse the interest of a single Senator on the other side of the aisle to anything whatever that is said about Cuba. One would get the impression that the very mention of the word "Cuba" was enough to empty

at least one-half of the Senate Chamber, and perhaps to empty the minds of those whom we expected to have some interest in a menace to our national security only 90 miles from our own shore. It seems to me that that very odd silence either betokens disinterest or apathy, or, what is even more chilling, the entire absence of a foreign policy position with regard to Cuba.

I am sure the Senator will agree with me that it is hardly foreign policy to leap from crisis to crisis the way a mountain goat leaps from precipice to precipice, and call that foreign policy. We all know that along about September or October of next year we shall be confronted with a Cuban crisis. We all know that as the leaves begin to fall, the press releases fall with them. The television and the radio become magnetized with new fervor. Then a great crisis will confront the American people, at which point they are asked to forget everything that ever went on before—to forget the apathy, to forget the do nothingness, and to forget the absence of a foreign policy. They are asked to forget that everything that went before was a failure to meet the responsibility to the security of the Western World and the free world to rid the free people of the world of this nest of aggressive Communist invaders armed to the teeth and bent upon our destruction.

Then, as we turn on our television sets in September and October of 1964, we shall be expected to believe that history begins again. At that time we will be advised that a crisis confronts the American people, and that all of our leadership and our foreign policy advisers are in accord that we should move forward with vigor and determination to rid the world of this great menace. All the American people are supposed to bow down and say, "Hail, hail, O Chief. Thou hast presented us with a solution to our problems." The people are expected to be duly grateful.

Then as the leaves continue to fall and the snow begins to fly in mid-November we will be right back to the place at which we started.

I commend the Senator from Utah for his presentation. He has indeed raised once more the recurring question, When are we going to get the Russians out of Cuba? When will we do something to keep a menace 90 miles from us from growing and growing until it is no longer a menace but an enemy in action against our people?

When will our Government have a policy about Cuba which represents the policy of the American people to prevent the further aggression of Soviet communism, which is both ominous and deadly, and, if we have a policy, when will they tell the American people about it?

Again I salute the Senator for his presentation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have not been present in the Chamber while the Senator delivered his entire address, but I have had the opportunity to read a summary. I

should like, with the Senator's permission, to comment briefly. It seems to me that whether one agrees with every prescription of the Senator or not—and I happen to agree thoroughly with the one he is making today, which is the exploitation of the psychological arsenal—it is a fact that the Senator is thoughtfully urging a positive course of affirmative acts by our Government in respect to Cuba. In that statement, any member of our party, whatever wing of the Republican Party to which he belongs, can join hands. It is the function of the minority to see that our Government does something about Cuba to give it the best counsel and guidance that we humanly can do so on that score.

The points of pressure which the Senator has outlined are undoubtedly sound. They are points of economic and diplomatic pressure. For myself, I feel very strongly about collaboration with the other American states. I feel very strongly about the possibility of a mutual defense treaty in the Caribbean with the Central American countries which are the most threatened.

Whatever may be my prescriptions, they do not have to agree with those of the Senator from Utah, for whom I have the utmost respect and personal regard. The fact is that it is the intention of the minority to insist that we need not stand still in this situation merely because one door has been blocked, to wit, the door of forceful action, which may have come as a result of our confrontation in October, but which happily did not. Though we did not win a whole victory, at least we demonstrated that the temper of the American people in respect to Cuba was such that they would even dare atomic war if they felt the danger in Cuba had come to the real danger that we discovered in October. The Senator is completely right about the psychological arsenal. We are underusing it, pointedly and markedly, with respect to Cuba. We are certainly underusing it almost as badly with respect to central Europe.

We starve our information services. We do not use the ingenuity of either economic or psychological warfare with the Communists almost anywhere in the world until we get into a hot war. In an atomic war it will be much too late.

So I join with the Senator from Utah in that part of his prescription. The weapon proposed is a great weapon. We are the most skillful publicists in the world when it comes to toothpaste, tires, and automobiles, but we fall flat as a flat tire when it comes to the struggles of the cold war.

I am glad to hear the Senator's distinguished voice raised, because he is a conservative member of my party, and it is good to identify those things in which we can speak together in favor of the United States spending some money and taking some action in the psychological warfare line.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and I served together in the House. We joined hands many times on issues, though he and I do not see eye to eye on every issue. On the present question we always see eye to eye, as I do now

with the Senator from Utah. The weapon of psychology is a powerful weapon. Let us use it.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator from New York. He has demonstrated that there can be unity among the Republicans when the problems of national security are at stake.

I should like to go a little deeper into the question of psychological warfare. I was speaking of defections.

The value of these defections would be enhanced, beyond merely psychological considerations, by the vital information the Soviet troops would bring with them. I need not spell out the details but merely assert that, with this information, our conjectures about the military buildup in Cuba might well become hard, reliable intelligence.

SOVIET DEFECTIONS KNOWN

These suggestions are not wild dreams, Mr. President. The defection of Soviet personnel is a reality, everywhere in the world where the opportunity exists. It is going on today in Cuba where, according to every report from Cuban freedom fighters, Soviet officers and men are joining the anti-Castro partisans in the Cuban hills. These men have voted with their feet. They have chosen freedom—in the face of grave risk and the threat of terrible retaliation. Let us improve their opportunities. Let us increase their incentives. Let us now match our dedication to theirs. Let us both stimulate and reward their courage.

To all the proposals and all the suggestions for devising a new and effective Cuba policy, I urge consideration of this added step. Let this Freedom Bounty constitute one more incentive in the march toward Cuban liberation. But, Mr. President, I repeat that all the proposals to which I have referred are just that: proposals for possible courses of action.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator has used the word "bounty," which to me has a much greater American connotation than the word "blackmail." I like the concept of paying a bounty to those who will voluntarily leave Cuba, much more than surrendering to the blackmail of Castro who says:

Give us tractors, give us medicine, give us guarantees or we will continue to keep your people in prison.

I served in the House of Representatives for many years with a delightful and distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania by the name of Bob Rich, who periodically—once or twice a week—would stand in the well of the House as he confronted the statistical report from the Department of the Treasury, and a new spending request, to say, "Where are we going to get the money?"

I ask the Senator from Utah a question. If the administration should say, "This is a pretty good idea, but where are we going to get the money?" Would the Senator agree with me that if the administration were to take a single step—that is, to give to Americans the

assurance that those who desire to contribute to a Cuban Freedom Bounty Committee would be given the same tax concessions accorded to the corporations which provided the medicine in exchange for prisoners—there would be no difficulty whatsoever in raising a sufficiently large bounty fund by volunteer contributions from patriotic Americans so that as Soviet defectors and Cuban defectors came to this country they could be provided with a home, or a little farm, or a business opportunity, so that they could work with fellow freedom-loving Cubans for the eventual installation of freedom in Cuba?

Mr. BENNETT. That certainly would be an interesting extension of a program the administration adopted when it faced the earlier proposition of gathering funds for blackmail or ransom.

Mr. MUNDT. I cannot escape the conviction that a great many more Americans would be willing to contribute of their funds for a bounty, for a reward, or for a grubstake for people defecting from Cuba than were willing to contribute ransom money or blackmail money, either in terms of tractors or of medicine.

Mr. BENNETT. It is an interesting extension of the idea.

Mr. President, I continue: If the administration has better and more effective strategies and can gather a wider arsenal of psychological weapons let us hear what they are. We will welcome and support them. We are looking neither for personal glory nor partisan advantage—rather, we are seeking indications of firmness of purpose and a will to victory. We plead for some sign that the administration is ready, finally, to lead all the people of the Americas toward the goals of freedom and justice.

Let us be done, therefore, with empty promises, with unfilled pledges, with endless evasions and delays. There are times when men, and nations, of principle must declare themselves, must stand up and be counted. There are issues that must be boldly met and effectively resolved. This is just such a time, Mr. President, and Cuban liberation is just such an issue.

UNITY IN OCTOBER

In October last the battleline was clearly drawn, and the courage with which our leaders met that confrontation thrilled the American people with a unity of support. Events since have been bewildering and discouraging. They bring to my mind the same Biblical passage that flashed its warning to me then. Let me repeat it again to the Senators today. Christ said, as recorded in St. Luke, chapter 9, verse 62: "No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God."

We have just done that. Last October we put our hands to the plough, and then we turned back. Fortunately there is still time to save the situation by recovering our original boldness. But every passing day strengthens our enemy and increases our difficulties. We must not allow the Cuban problem, and the slavery of the Cuban people, to be forgotten or to become a sacrificial pawn in a global

program to keep Khrushchev smiling. When do we put our hands back on the plow, and start plowing? When do we demonstrate in Cuba that we are "fit for the kingdom?"

The American people have never lost their will to win, and will rally again to the administration as they did last October when they see this determination become again the basis of its Cuban policy. And if and when this happens, who in the United States, in Cuba, in Latin America—yes, who in the world—can doubt its outcome?

Mr. CURTIS and Mr. HICKEN-LOOPER addressed the Chair.

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Utah for his thoughts and for the time spent on his remarks, as well as for provoking interest on the Senate floor. The Senator's suggestions are meritorious.

It seems to me quite apropos that the speech be made today, when the Senate is considering an authorization bill dealing with outer space. Many Americans laud the great accomplishments in that area but are also concerned about the question, "In the meantime, who is going to control the earth?"

It is a real problem. We cannot escape. We cannot sweep under the rug the problem 90 miles from our shore, or close our eyes to it.

Mr. BENNETT. I appreciate the thoughts of my friend from Nebraska.

I now yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Utah. He has delivered a most perceptive and timely speech on a subject which is of great seriousness. He has pointed out that an uncertain policy and dilatory actions have consistently led us into more confusion internationally than we have been in for many years. I think it is timely for him to speak now, and I congratulate the Senator for the vigor of his presentation and for the truth of what he has said.

I know of no other time when international tensions have been so great and confusion and uncertainty of policy so evident. That, more than anything else, has been a great disservice to the development of the real unity of purpose of the nations we hope to have allied with us in fighting the great ideological battle and other battles in the world; and it has been a disservice in respect to stimulating adherence to our side among nations which are neutral and groping for leadership, which they have not yet found in our policy.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank my friend from Iowa, the ranking Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee; whose voice is important on all questions involving foreign policy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7500) to authorize ap-

propriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations; and for other purposes.

Several Senators addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is recognized.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to H.R. 7500 which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, after line 25, it is proposed to delete the period and to insert the following:

Provided, however, That any funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended for the conduct of any scientific or technological research or development activity for or on behalf of any person providing satellite communications services other than an agency of the United States Government, or for the furnishing to or on behalf of any such person of any scientific or technological advice or information, Provided, however, That such person has been obligated by contract to make reimbursement to the Administration for a proportionate share of all costs incurred for or in connection with the conduct of such activity or the furnishing of such advice or information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] to the committee amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I shall take only a minute to explain the purposes of the amendment. This amendment would achieve the objectives which the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and 15 other Senators tried to achieve, and I hope it will overcome the objection raised by the Senator in charge of the bill. It makes the action of reimbursement post facto, and not beforehand. There is no obligation to prove in advance what benefits will accrue to the corporation. It is only after the benefits have been assumed by this company that there will be a responsibility to reimburse.

The amendment would also eliminate the Comptroller General. I do not know how the Senator in charge of the bill, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] feels, but I believe it is necessary for the record to offer the amendment, because it does precisely what many of us feel is essential; namely, to see that the Government of the United States does not pay for services which benefit a certain private group or company, but expends the money to it on a loan or reimbursable basis.

The amendment would eliminate the technical and I think valid objection which the Senator from New Mexico raised; namely, that it would be difficult or impossible to calculate what the benefits would be in advance, and that he does not want to involve the Comptroller General. The benefits will be considered only after they have been received, and

only after they have been requested. It will be in the nature of a postaudit or than a preaudit.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I did not make a point of order against this amendment, because it is not necessarily the same as the previous one. I hope it will be voted down. In view of the amendment previously offered, I hope the Senate will wait and see what would be accomplished by the language that has already been adopted. Therefore, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send amendments to the desk, which I offer at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with, and that they be considered as though read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE's amendments are as follows:

On page 9, line 11, strike out "\$5,511,520,400" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,203,719,400".

On page 9, line 12, strike out "\$4,225,275,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,013,175,000".

On page 9, lines 17 and 18, strike out "\$1,556,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,436,600,000".

On page 9, line 20, strike out "\$1,153,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,138,500,000".

On page 9, lines 22 and 23, strike out "\$140,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$125,000,000".

On page 10, lines 2 and 3, strike out "\$44,175,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$42,175,000".

On page 10, lines 5 and 6, strike out "\$194,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$190,400,000".

On page 10, line 8, strike out "\$282,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$254,400,000".

On page 10, line 13, strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$30,600,000".

On page 10, line 20, strike out "\$96,687,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$91,687,000".

On page 10, line 25, strike out "\$220,200,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$216,700,000".

On page 11, line 2, strike out "\$747,060,400" and insert in lieu thereof "\$682,359,400".

On page 11, strike out all in lines 5 and 6, and renumber succeeding paragraphs accordingly.

On page 11, line 8, strike out "\$20,332,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$17,032,500".

On page 11, line 14, strike out "\$300,316,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$279,677,000".

On page 11, lines 23 and 24, strike out "\$102,198,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$92,698,000".

On page 12, line 3, strike out "\$168,253,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$148,653,000".

On page 12 strike out all in lines 4 and 5, and renumber the following paragraph accordingly.

On page 12, line 7, strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$15,000,000".

On page 12, line 8, strike out "\$539,185,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$508,185,000".

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio indicate the nature of the amendment, without reading it?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am about to make a unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that 30 minutes be allotted to each amendment still to be offered and considered, 15 minutes to a side, to be under the control of the author of the amendment and the Senator handling the bill, and 1 hour on the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator will yield, on the Lausche amendment, I wonder if the Senator would allow 20 minutes to the Senator from Ohio? Make it 20 minutes to the Senator from Ohio and 10 minutes in opposition.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I amend my request to 20 minutes on each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio wish his amendments to be considered en bloc?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate provides some \$5½ billion for an agency called the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I am interested, and I feel that many other Senators are interested, in aviation. Yet less than nine-tenths of 1 percent would go into aviation research.

I wonder if the Senator will be good enough to reserve some time to discuss this question, not to amend the bill, because I do not feel it is wise to amend the bill at this time, but to discuss the importance of aviation to America's future prestige.

If the Senator will be good enough to yield 10 or 15 minutes for that purpose, that is all I ask.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am certain the Senator handling the bill or some other Senator will be glad to yield him that time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I do not want to be frozen by any agreement, but could the Senator give me 5 minutes to speak on the Securities and Exchange Commission matter in the next half hour or three-quarters of an hour?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am sure that Senators who wish to speak will agree to that request. Could the Senator let action be taken on the Lausche amendment first?

Mr. JAVITS. That could take 40 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If all the time were used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, is the limitation 30 minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Forty minutes; twenty minutes to a side.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, my amendments, if adopted would reduce the total amount of the appropriation for NASA's work from \$5,511,520,400, to

A5092

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 9

day, July 21, 1963, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald—appended to these remarks—the researchers' findings were the result of a 32-month-long study financed in part by a grant from the National Institute of Neurology and Blindness of the National Institutes of Health.

Privately endowed organizations working for the enlargement of scientific knowledge are the unique and tangible expressions of a free society. Since they derive their main support from charitable gifts they satisfy the commendable urge within many to "be our brothers' keepers" while at the same time refuting the Marxian principle that all benefits must and do flow from the state.

Government-sponsored research does have its place in our society since vast sums are required to carry on intensive and time-consuming studies. Currently, for example, more than \$1.5 billion is being expended in basic medical research with approximately two-thirds of this amount being provided by Federal and State agencies. But the importance of private research, through industrial and privately endowed institutions, may be seen in the fact that more than \$500 million is provided by these nongovernment organizations.

It is a source of considerable pride that the world's greatest concentration of medical and scientific activity is located within Montgomery County, a part of the Sixth Congressional District of Maryland, which I am privileged to represent.

Federal agencies, such as the National Institutes of Health, the Naval Ordnance Laboratory, the Bethesda Naval Hospital, Walter Reed Army Medical Center, the National Bureau of Standards, and the Atomic Energy Commission have created an exciting and stimulating scientific community which has, in turn, attracted major nongovernment research institutions such as the Applied Physics Laboratory of Johns Hopkins University, large divisions of Vitro Corp. of America, and a host of other independent research and development organizations.

The National Institutes of Health alone currently conducts more than 1,400 research projects in its laboratories. But the importance of independence and freedom of action in scientific inquiry is recognized by the National Institutes which, since 1946, has provided grants to support the research studies of non-Federal organizations, including medical schools, colleges, hospitals, and scientific institutions. During fiscal 1962 this phase of the NIH program provided funds for 14,882 independent projects in non-Federal institutions.

It is this unique partnership of Federal and non-Federal institutions that has made it possible for such privately sponsored organizations as the Eye Research Foundation of Bethesda to develop its singularly effective program of research within the very shadows of the National Institutes.

Organized as a nonprofit trust for charitable, scientific and educational purposes on Christmas Day, 1957, the foundation is directed by Dr. William M. Hart, a recognized research and ophthal-

mology specialist with the assistance of Dr. Robert H. Peckham, a specialist in biophysical research. Remarkable progress has been made in the 5 years since its founding with 15 major reports having been published in scientific journals.

The private financial support it has attracted has enabled construction of a major new research building which will be occupied later this month. The larger quarters and new, modern equipment will result in greatly expanded basic research and clinical programs in cataract, glaucoma, retinal function, and cancer of the eye. A major phase of the foundation's work will be channeled into rehabilitation programs implementing the results of research to assist those with serious vision defects.

The foundation's work has been encouraging and its recent findings in the field of cataract research augurs well for those who are working toward the day of eventual control and elimination of this and other blinding diseases.

The above-mentioned Post article follows:

RATS TESTED TO END CATARACTS

(By Nate Haseltine)

Bethesda scientists are looking into the eyes of test white rats, searching for the cause and possible prevention of human cataracts.

They have already reported finding the first direct evidence of a failure in a biological process in the development of diet-induced cataracts.

The animal studies are underway at the Eye Research Foundation of Bethesda, a nonprofit trust fund set up nearly 6 years ago for pioneering studies on such conditions as cataract, glaucoma, retinal function, and cancer of the eye.

Reporting their first clue in cataract development were Drs. William M. Hart and Robert H. Peckham, ophthalmologists, and Janet Appel, research associate. They reported the findings, now prepared for publication, to a recent meeting of the Association for Research in Ophthalmology, in Atlantic City, during the American Medical Association meetings.

The research, they reported, demonstrated for the first time in the intact eye a mechanism of cataract formation that occurs before actual clouding of the eyelens.

The normal lens of the human, and rat, eye is clear and transparent. In cataract formation, natural or induced, the lens clouds to a milky white, much like the clear albumen of an egg turns white in boiling water.

The Bethesda scientists sought to find out what happens in the animal eye before clouding occurs. They knew they could induce cataract formation by feeding rats a diet rich in galactose, sugar obtained from milk.

Somewhat of the same process is known to occur in the inborn cataract-forming process in infant victims of a congenital condition called galactosemia. Here the child's body chemistry lacks an enzyme which normally converts galactose to fructose, a sugar with optical properties. Infants with the chemical error may be saved from the otherwise inevitable cataracts if placed early enough on a milk-free diet.

To those who question the meaningfulness of studying a human affliction in a rat's eye, it can be pointed out that it was research on the premature eyes of mice that led to the eventual conquest of the human blinding disease, retrolental fibroplasia. The research showed that this disease was due to overexposure of oxygen to premature babies in incubators.

The Bethesda investigators also are studying rat eye lens in all forms of development, from the tiniest speck of the lens in the rat embryo to that of the fully mature eye.

Such research necessarily involves destruction of the lens in the progressive stages of development, so the findings must be related statistically through generations of rats, rather than through the growth and development of a single eye.

Using the convenient experimental way to produce cataracts by loading the rat's diet with galactose, the foundation scientists found that though the opacity of the forming cataract occurs some 4 days after the start of the special feeding there are earlier changes which occur during the first 24 hours after the diet's start.

The changes, they reported, involve an increased flow of fluid into the lens, with subsequent loss of eye proteins and potassium from the lens. This signifies, they said, an imbalance in what is called the active transport system, the delicately balanced body mechanism which chemically harmonizes the lens tissue with its surrounding environment.

For about 2 weeks, their experiments showed, the lens seem to maintain some measure of control, and then there is a rapid collapse of the transport system. The breakdown involves sudden loss of nitrogen and potassium from the lens, and a water-logging of the now cataractic lens.

The Bethesda investigators now are trying to find out if similar changes occur with other cataract-producing agents, such as radiation. Finally, they will need to relate their results to human processes of cataract formation.

The research program is being conducted in temporary laboratory facilities at 4806 Rugby Avenue, Bethesda.

Splitting the Peninsula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our Nation's attention is focused upon the limited atomic test ban, we must not forget that communism is pressing ruthlessly forward in Asia. What is transpiring on the western rim of the Pacific has a direct bearing on our national security and ultimately upon the survival of the free world and our Nation itself.

Because of these considerations, I invite the attention of the House to an article, "Splitting the Peninsula," by Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps, retired, director, national security and foreign affairs, appearing in the June issue of the VFW American Security Reporter, which is published monthly by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, under the direction of Mr. Byron B. Gentry, commander in chief of the VFW.

This article is timely in that it analyzes in basic understandable terms the combined diplomatic and military tactics which communism is employing in its continuing drive to conquer the vitally important southeast Asian peninsula. The article contains one of the first dis-

1963

Mineral County, W. Va., Surveyed Nearly 300 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 9, 1963

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a recent article in the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail tells of several historically important surveys made in what is now Mineral County, W. Va.

The first known mention of this region was in the report of John Lederer, an Austrian surveyor sent out by the British Crown in 1669. A subsequent survey was made by George Washington in 1748. Nearly a half century later Claudius Crozet, a military engineer who served under Napoleon Bonaparte, surveyed this section for what was to become the old Northwestern Turnpike—now U.S. Highway 50 west.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article in the Gazette-Mail be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

ROYALTY SURVEYED MINERAL COUNTY

The rich land which lies around and in the present Mineral County was always of interest to the British Crown and its queen colony, Virginia. The first known mention of the territory was in the report of John Lederer, an Austrian surveyor sent out in 1669 to ascertain just what lay in the western portion of the Dominion.

Mayo's Commission was sent out by the King in 1736 to survey Lord Fairfax's land, and the Fairfax Stone was erected at this time near the present town of Thomas.

George Washington surveyed here in 1748; stayed with Farmer Brown in his log cabin on New Creek, and later met with an Indian raiding party. With an exchange of "fire water" and a session of "peace-pipe smoking" the meeting was peaceful.

The first fort south of the Potomac River was built by the Ohio company in 1750 near what is now Ridgeley, W. Va., and from this territory General Cresap conscripted his Revolutionary soldiers to join Washington's army at Boston.

The old Northwestern Turnpike, or U.S. 50 west, was laid out through this section by Claudius Crozet, military engineer of Napoleon Bonaparte on the basis of surveying done by the Lewis party in 1748; such an excellent job that only one curve was subsequently changed on the 5-mile grade up Allegheny Front Mountain.

Mineral County lies in what was the original Orange County, Va., a county created by the Virginia House of Burgesses in 1734. Orange County contained the present States of West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky. In 1738 the land east of the Alleghenies was divided into Lower Augusta and Upper Frederick Counties. Hampshire County was proclaimed in 1754 from land lying in each of these counties. Mineral County was finally formed from Hampshire County by act of the new West Virginia Legislature on February 1, 1866—the second county to be named by the new governing body.

The county seat of Keyser figured significantly during the Civil War because it was an important center for the B. & O. Railroad.

The railroad had been completed to here in 1852. Up until this event the town was called Paddytown in honor of Patrick McCarthy who had settled here in 1760. When the railroad was completed the name was changed to New Creek—a name of somewhat more dignity for a growing railroad metropolis. The present name of Keyser was given the county seat in 1874 when the B. & O. Division was moved from Piedmont to "New Creek." This was the name of the vice president of the company at the time.

"New Creek" was the site of Fort Fuller, a Federal fort which occupied the entire hill where Potomac State College now stands. It was supported by Fort McWilliams on a hill directly behind it and by Fort Plano, constructed on a facing ridge. The Confederates were never able to capture and occupy these positions, but they did great damage to supplies, and so forth, through cavalry raids.

Mineral County has been the scene of wild, boisterous exploitation of natural resources—colorful railroading history and rugged mountain farming. The scenic beauty of the county is unsurpassed in the entire country. Her citizens are definitely working for progress but are hoping not to destroy her picturesque originality in the process.

West Virginia Group Lauds James B. Donovan for His Service to Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 9, 1963

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the free world has been truly heartened and helped through the efforts of an American attorney who gives his time and talents so that men and women everywhere can know the joys of freedom.

James B. Donovan has performed a genuine service for mankind by arranging the exchange of Cuban prisoners and other persons held captive by the Communist regime of Fidel Castro. With determination, with skill, and with patience, Attorney Donovan contacted the Castro government, and after numerous reversals and delays, worked out acceptable terms for the release of men, women, and children who otherwise would still be languishing in the hostile atmosphere of today's Cuba.

As a recognition of his contribution to the cause of freedom, the Jefferson County Voiture 1356 of the Grande Voiture of the State of West Virginia, La Société des 40 Hommes et 8 Chevaux, adopted on July 11, 1963, a resolution in his honor. The resolution observes in part that James B. Donovan has "saved countless lives and prevented the bloodshed of human beings and through his unceasing efforts has brought joy to the families of countless Cuban refugees and has through his individual initiative advanced and demonstrated the philosophy and ideals of the American principles of international brotherhood, particularly with the peoples of our Western Hemisphere."

Mr. President, it is a privilege to join in this merited praise of James B. Donovan. He is a credit to this Nation, and

has served well the cause of freedom and democracy. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Jefferson County Voiture 1356 of the Grande Voiture of the State of West Virginia, La Société des 40 Hommes et 8 Chevaux, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas James B. Donovan has meritoriously given of his time and talents in successfully freeing from bondage Cuban Nationals and other prisoners; and

Whereas James B. Donovan has saved countless lives and prevented the bloodshed of human beings and through his unceasing efforts has brought joy and happiness to the families of countless Cuban refugees and has through his individual initiative advanced and demonstrated the philosophy and ideals of the American principles of international brotherhood, particularly with the peoples of our Western Hemisphere: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Jefferson County Voiture 1356 of the Grande Voiture of the State of West Virginia, La Société des 40 Hommes et 8 Chevaux does recognize the endeavors and accomplishments of James B. Donovan in the freeing of countless thousands of Cuban refugees from imprisonment in Cuba; and be it further

Resolved, That this Nation through the Congress of the United States or other appropriate governmental body take steps to achieve this purpose and; be it further

Resolved, That Jefferson County Voiture 1356 through its resolution committee take whatever steps necessary to publicize the action taken by this Voiture.

Dated this 11th day of July 1963.

Jefferson County Voiture 1356, Grande Voiture of the State of West Virginia.

By: DEAN NICHOLS,
Chairman, Resolution Committee.

Research for Cause and Prevention of Human Cataracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 8, 1963

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, recently reported findings concerning eye cataract formation dramatize the role being played by privately endowed researchers working in concert with Federal research institutions.

The Eye Research Foundation of Bethesda, a nonprofit trust created in 1957 to conduct pioneering studies into the causes of blindness, presented its findings to the Association for Research in Ophthalmology during the recent meeting of the American Medical Association in Atlantic City.

The foundation's research team is the first to demonstrate chemical changes which occur in the eye before clouding of the lens occurs. The importance of this work may be seen in the fact that this is the first direct evidence of a failure in biological processes prior to the visual appearance of cataract.

Subject of a lengthy review by Science Writer Nate Hazeltine in the Sun-